## REMARKS

#### Claim status

Claims 1-20 were pending in the case at the time of the current Office Action. Claims 2-7 and 14-18 are amended herein. Claims 1-20 are currently pending in the application.

### Section 112 rejections

In the current Office action, claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for a preamplifier system circuit, does not reasonably provide enablement for amplifying a sensed signal by the preamplifier system circuit. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to operate the pacing system of the invention commensurate in scope with these claims. Paragraph [0021] describes the claimed method for determination of the presence of an evoked response includes the steps of amplifying the sensed signal by the preamplifier system of claims 1 or 4. Claims 1 and 4 do not provide an enabling disclosure for connecting the preamplifier system to sense signals.

Applicants respectfully traverse the foregoing rejections in view of the above pending claims and for reasons set forth hereafter.

For a person skilled in the art, it is well known from the art that, for pacemakers, the sensed signals are provided by lead electrodes to the circuitry and that sensing occurs at the lead tip. This is also detailed in Fig. 1, Fig. 2, and Fig. 5 of the present application and explained in paragraph [0028] of the present application. Moreover, claim 1 states: "...and sensing signals from the myocardium of multiple chambers of the heart...comprising: a preamplifier system circuit having at least two inputs for sensing signals to be picked up by at least two electrodes adapted to pick up the sensing signals, the preamplifier further comprises ...".

Therefore, in view of at least the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1 and 4 do provide an enabling disclosure for connecting the preamplifier system to sensed signals, and it is respectfully submitted that claims 1 and 4 define allowable subject matter. Also, since claims 2-3 and 5-17 depend either directly or indirectly from one of claims 1 and 4, it is

- 12 -Ser. No. 10/540,309 Response to Office Action of 11/02/07 Atty Docket 117163.00128

respectfully submitted that claims 2-3 and 5-17 define allowable subject matter as well. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 1-17 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, be removed.

In the current Office action, claims 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Regarding claim 18, it is unclear what is meant by opening the switches in front of the buffer amplifiers. Regarding claim 19, it is unclear what is meant by observing a programmable detection time window.

Applicants respectfully traverse the foregoing rejections in view of the above pending claims and for reasons set forth hereafter.

Claim 18 has been amended herein (in particular, step b) to clarify what is meant by opening the switches in front of the buffer amplifiers. Also, the language "observing a programmable detection time window" of claim 19 means the same thing that is meant by this same language in claim 12, which is not rejected under 35 U.S.C., second paragraph, in the outstanding Office action.

Therefore, in view of at least the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the language of claims 18-20 is clear, and it is respectfully submitted that claims 18-20 define allowable subject matter. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 18-20 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, be removed.

## Section 102 rejections

In the current Office action, claims 1, 4, 5, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Whigham et al. (US 4,821,724), hereinafter Whigham.

Applicants respectfully traverse the foregoing rejections in view of the above pending claims and for reasons set forth hereafter.

Independent claim 1 recites a pacing system for pacing multiple chambers of the heart and sensing signals from the myocardium of multiple chambers of the heart which will allow the

Ser. No. 10/540,309 Response to Office Action of 11/02/07

Atty Docket 117163.00128

verification of a cardiac evoked response resulting from a delivered charge to the heart tissue comprising:

- a preamplifier system circuit having at least two inputs for sensing signals to be picked up by at least two electrodes adapted to pick up the sensing signals, the preamplifiers further comprises
- a DC coupled buffer amplifier first stage [emphasis added], comprising at least one buffer amplifier for each of the at least two electrode inputs,
- a switch matrix [emphasis added] following the buffer amplifiers allowing sensing of the differential between any two of the at least two electrode inputs,
- a next stage of differential amplifiers providing gain to either the differential between any two electrode inputs or one input to ground, and
- d) a next stage filter stage.

Independent claim 4 recites a pacing system for pacing multiple chambers of the heart and sensing signals from the myocardium of multiple chambers of the heart which will allow the verification of a cardiac evoked response resulting from a delivered charge to the heart tissue, the pacing system having a pacing circuit capable of pacing multiple chambers of the heart, the pacing system comprising:

a preamplifier system having:

- a) a DC coupled buffer amplifier stage [emphasis added],
- a switch matrix [emphasis added] following the buffer amplifiers allowing sensing of the differential between any two electrodes implanted in the heart,
- a next stage of differential amplifiers providing gain to either the differential between any two electrode Inputs or one Input to ground, and
- d) a next stage wideband bandpass filter with gain, having an output and internal switches capable of discharging charges transferred across the Input allowing the output of bandpass filter to be reset to analog ground.

Ser. No. 10/540,309 Response to Office Action of 11/02/07 Atty Docket 117163.00128

It is respectfully submitted that Whigham does not anticipate the claimed subject matter of independent claims 1 and 4. In particular, Whigham does not teach, suggest, or describe a DC coupled buffer amplifier and a switch matrix. According to Whigham, the input signals are directly directed to a differential amplifier. A DC coupled buffer amplifier does not exist in Whigham. Similarly, a switch matrix does not exist in the device of Whigham. Apparently, the Examiner has mistaken the switchable damping circuit of Whigham for the switch matrix of the present application, which it is not.

When amplifying sensed signals (mentioned in Whigham as ECG processing), amplifier 22 is operating as a differential amplifier, not as a DC coupled buffer amplifier (see col. 9, line 48 to col. 10, line 9 and Fig. 5). Thus, no DC coupled buffer amplifier for sensing is disclosed in Whigham. The bank of switches having 288k resistors in combination with 144k resistors shown left in Fig. 2B serves as an attenuator controlling sensitivity, not as a switch matrix (see col. 7, lines 1 to 17, Fig. 5 and Fig. 6).

Input signals to the differential amplifier in Whigham originate from the same lead only (see explanation of dual chamber operation in col. 4, lines 58 to 68). Even if the choice of switching between the case or ring (in case of bipolar leads) as anode is disclosed, there is neither differential amplification of analog signals of different leads, nor differential amplification of more than two signals of the same lead in parallel possible. Whereas, in the present application, input signals to the differential amplifier may originate from any of the same or different leads controlled by the setting of the switch matrix.

A basic feature of the claimed subject matter of claims 1 and 4 is the possibility to evaluate different signals of different electrodes. This is only made possible by a combination of a DC coupled buffer amplifier and a switch matrix. Since these features are neither disclosed nor rendered obvious by Whigham, the claimed subject matter of claims 1 and 4 is neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by Whigham. Furthermore, in Whigham, only different signals of each one electrode may be evaluated. Whigham discloses to measure a signal between a tip and a ring electrode or a tip electrode and an implant's case, each for the similar electrode, but this cannot be done simultaneously by the device of Whigham.

Therefore, in view of at least the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 1 and 4 are not anticipated by Whigham, and it is respectfully submitted that claims 1 and Ser. No. 10/540,309 Response to Office Action of 11/02/07

Atty Docket 117163.00128

4 define allowable subject matter. Also, since claims 5 and 14 depend either directly or indirectly from one of claims 1 and 4, it is respectfully submitted that claims 5 and 14 define allowable subject matter as well. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 1, 4, 5, and 14 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) be removed.

# Section 103 rejections

In the current Office action, claims 2, 3, 6-13, and 15-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Whigham.

Applicants respectfully traverse the foregoing rejections in view of the above pending claims and for reasons set forth hereafter.

Independent claim 17 recites a method for operating a pacing system for verifying the capture of the myocardium, the method including the following steps:

- a) delivering a pacing pulse of programmable amplitude and pulse width,
- b) performing a first autoshort for a programmable time length,
- unblanking the amplifier system after the first autoshort and sensing an evoked response signal during a programmable sensing time window,
- amplifying the sensed signal by a preamplifier system having a <u>DC coupled buffer</u> amplifier first stage connected to a switch matrix [emphasis added],
- e) sending the amplified signal to the narrowband bandpass filter to allow passage of frequencies contained in the evoked response,
- f) comparing the signal from the band pass filter to a threshold value, and, if the signal exceeds the threshold value, generating a capture detected signal, and
- g) blanking the amplifier system at the end of the programmable sensing time window, and invoking the second autoshort for a programmable length of time.

Independent claim 18 recites a method for operating a pacing system for determining the presence of an evoked response of the myocardium, the method including the following steps:

Ser. No. 10/540,309

Response to Office Action of 11/02/07

Atty Docket 117163.00128

- a) delivering a programmable stimulating monophasic pulse, followed by a programmable autoshort period which is shorter than the time between the end of the pace pulse and the beginning of an evoked response signal,
- b) opening switches connected to the input of <u>buffer amplifiers</u> [emphasis added] during the delivering of the pulse and the autoshort period, and closing the switches connected to the input of the buffer amplifiers immediately at the end of the autoshort period,
- at the same time during the delivering of the pulse and the autoshort period opening all blanking switches and setting all amplifier inputs in the filter stages to system ground,
- d) closing the matrix switches of the <u>switch matrix</u> [emphasis added] and placing sensed signals at the inputs of the differential amplifiers,
- closing the switch connecting the output of the differential amplifier to the fast high pass filter,
- discharging the charge transferred across the high pass capacitor to system ground, The output of the first high pass is then switched to a low pass filter,
- g) switching the signal to the next high pass filter,
- h) discharging the charge transferred across the high pass capacitor to system ground,
- i)  $\;\;$  sending the output of the second high pass stage to the final low pass filter,
- j) switching the output of the final low pass filter, to the bandpass filter stage, and
- $\ k) \quad connecting \ the \ outputs \ of \ the \ bandpass \ filters \ to \ programmable \ threshold \ detectors.$

As stated previously herein, Whigham does not teach, suggest, or describe a DC coupled buffer amplifier and a switch matrix. According to Whigham, the input signals are directly directed to a differential amplifier. A DC coupled buffer amplifier does not exist in Whigham. Similarly, a switch matrix does not exist in the device of Whigham. Apparently, the Examiner has mistaken the switchable damping circuit of Whigham for the switch matrix of the present application, which it is not.

A basic feature of the claimed subject matter of claims 1, 4, 17 and 18 is the possibility to evaluate different signals of different electrodes. This is only made possible by a combination of a DC coupled buffer amplifier and a switch matrix. Since these features are neither disclosed nor rendered obvious by Whigham, the claimed subject matter of claims 1, 4, 17, and 18 is neither

Ser. No. 10/540,309 Response to Office Action of 11/02/07

Atty Docket 117163.00128

anticipated nor rendered obvious by Whigham. Furthermore, in Whigham, only different signals of each one electrode may be evaluated. Whigham discloses to measure a signal between a tip and a ring electrode or a tip electrode and an implant's case, each for the similar electrode, but this cannot be done simultaneously by the device of Whigham.

Therefore, in view of at least the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 1, 4, 17, and 18 are not unpatentable over Whigham, and it is respectfully submitted that claims 1, 4, 17, and 18 define allowable subject matter. Furthermore, since claims 2, 3, 6-13, 15-16, and 19-20 depend either directly or indirectly from on of claims 1, 4, 17, and 18, it is respectfully submitted that claims 2, 3, 6-13, 15-16, and 19-20 define allowable subject matter as well. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 2, 3, 6-13, and 15-20 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) be removed.

Accordingly, the applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejections based on at least the foregoing. After such reconsideration, it is urged that allowance of all pending claims will be in order.

Respectfully submitted,

David J. Muzilla Registration No. 50,914

Hahn Loeser & Parks LLP One GOJO Plaza Suite 300 Akron, OH 44311-1076 (330) 864-5550 Fax 330-864-7986 djmuzilla@hahnlaw.com

CUSTOMER No. 021324